



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,369	03/16/2004	John Michael Lake	RSW920040039US1	3169
71474 7590 02/06/2008 Steven E. Bach Attorney at Law 10 Roberts Road Newtown Square, PA 19073			EXAMINER KHATRI, ANIL	
			ART UNIT 2191	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/801,369

**Applicant(s)**

LAKE, JOHN MICHAEL

**Examiner**

Anil Khatri

**Art Unit**

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed on 12/17/05.
2. As per applicant's request claims 1-8 have been canceled.
3. As per applicant's request claim 11 have been amended.
4. Examiner has withdrawn USC 101 rejection of claims 9-11 upon clarification and amendment filled by the applicant.
5. As per applicant request claims 9-19 has been considered but they are not persuasive.
6. Claims 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Sliger et al* USPN 6,496,974.

***In remarks applicant argues,***

- I. Logic for determining a plurality of versions of the software component.
- II. Comparing the length of the compressed version.
- III. Providing a software complexity metric comprising a comparison of the length of the compressed version.
- IV. Finds a ratio using length of the compressed program and compressed version of normalized program.
- V. Unique normalized program text.

***In response to applicant's arguments,***

I. It was noted that the cited reference fairly suggests the logic for determining a plurality of versions of the software component (column 12, lines 47-54, While the invention has been illustrated in the context of providing a newer version of software to a user's computer, there are situations in which it is sometimes necessary to regress and replace a newer version with an older version. The same process can naturally be used, by pre-initializing the compressor/decompressor in accordance with newer version of the software, compressing the older version, etc.). Therefore, examiner interprets that method teaches having plurality of software version.

II. It was also noted that reference fairly teaches comparing the length of the compressed version (column 7, lines 19-35, the compression process proceeds, identifying successive "matches" between versions 3.02 and 2.04 of the file, and encoding same in the compressed output data as "tokens" specifying a particular location in the history window where a match was found, and the length (in bytes, bits, etc.) of the match. Portions of file 3.02 that do not match either any part of version 2.04, or any part of version 3.02 that has already been processed and now is in the dictionary, are encoded in the compressed output data stream as literal characters. The programming then causes the CPU to store the compressed output data from the compression process in a patch file 54. (The patch file may, but need not, include other data, such as self-extraction instructions, etc.) Due to the substantial redundancy between versions 2.04 and 3.02, the patch file is quite small, essentially comprising just the

Art Unit: 2191

differences between the two files). Therefore, examiner interprets that it allows to compare compressed version with bytes and find the difference between two files.

III. Cited reference also suggests and provides a software complexity metric comprising a comparison of the length of the compressed version (column 3, lines 5-18, the two distinct operations of pattern matching and compression (performed on the vendor's computer in prior art patch generation techniques) are replaced by a single operation that both compares old and new file versions, and produces a compressed output by which the latter can be generated from the former. Likewise, the two distinct operations of decompression and patch instruction application (performed on the user's computer in the prior art) are replaced by a single operation that both decompresses the patch file data and results in recreation of the new file. The patch file generated and used in these processes is of considerably reduced size--sometimes half the size of compressed patch files produced by prior art approaches). Therefore, examiner interprets that it allows comparing compressed version with matching scheme in old and new version.

IV. It was also noted that reference also teaches in finding a ratio using length of the compressed program and compressed version of normalized program (column 4, lines 9-25, The same pre-initialization approach can be applied to Markov model compressors. Again, the old file is first applied to the compressor. The compressor generates probability data statistically modeling the old data file (e.g. calculating the probability of encountering a symbol X after seeing a certain number of previous symbols). When the new file is thereafter applied

Art Unit: 2191

to the pre-initialized compressor, the existing probability data allows immediate compression efficiencies, producing a much more compact output file. This file is transferred to the user's computer. Again, as with LZ78, the user's computer has a compressor as well as a decompressor. Again, the copy of the old file on the user's computer is applied to the compressor, thereby generating the probability data with which the decompressor is pre-initialized. The compressed file from the vendor is then applied to the pre-initialized decompressor, regenerating the complete new file on the user's computer). Therefore, examiner interprets that it allows measuring different statistical calculation between old and new compressed version.

V. It was also noted that reference also teaches unique normalized program text 9column 9, lines 19-24, Normalizing is essentially a process of removing any differences that would be created as a result of typical installation modifications. Binding, lock prefixes removal, and rebasing are some of several such differences that can be normalized). Thus, examiner interprets that normalizing process takes place to normalize the version.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2191

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil Khatri whose telephone number is 571-272-3725. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

\*\*\*

  
**ANIL KHATRI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**